

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

DARNELL WESLEY MOON, #34077-044,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 15-cv-00876-JPG
)	
D. SCOTT DODRILL, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

GILBERT, District Judge:

This matter is now before the Court for consideration of Plaintiff Darnell Moon’s Second Motion to Rescind Restricted Filer Status. (Doc. 99). The filing restriction at issue was imposed by Chief Judge Michael Reagan on May 13, 2016, after Plaintiff’s underlying suit was dismissed with prejudice for failure to disclose his litigation history in his application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Doc. 68). Plaintiff did not mention more than sixty (60) cases he filed during his incarceration between 2008 and 2014 and more than three (3) “strikes” he received under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).¹ The Court found that the omissions were material, intentional, and fraudulent and entered an Order prohibiting Plaintiff from “**filing any further litigation in this Court until he pays all outstanding fees.**” (Doc. 68, p. 5) (emphasis added).

Plaintiff filed a motion to rescind the filing restriction on June 23, 2020, before he paid his outstanding filing fees. (Doc. 77). The Court denied the motion and extended the filing

¹ See *Moon v. Samuels*, No. 15-cv-861-JPG-SCW (S.D. Ill.) (Doc. 103, pp. 1-2) (citing *Green v. Warden, U.S. Penitentiary*, 699 F.2d 364 (7th Cir. 1983) (federal court may take judicial notice of other court proceedings related to the matter at bar)); *Moon v. Walton*, No. 15-cv-889-JPG-SCW (S.D. Ill.) (Doc. 87, p. 1); *Moon v. Rivas*, No. 15-cv-890-JPG-DGW (S.D. Ill.) (Doc. 19; Doc. 29, p. 3); *Moon v. Rivas*, No. 15-cv-891-SMY-PMF (S.D. Ill.) (Doc. 69); *Moon v. Garcia*, No. 15-cv-921-SMY-RJD (S.D. Ill.) (Doc. 43). He also failed to disclose at least seventeen (17) cases he filed during supervised release, including more than a half-dozen in this District.

restriction “until such time as his outstanding filing fees of \$2902.00 are paid in full.” (Doc. 80). Plaintiff was advised that he could seek modification or rescission of the Order no sooner than July 21, 2022. *Id.*

Plaintiff’s second motion to rescind restricted filer status is denied for the same reason as the first motion. (Doc. 99). He still has not paid his outstanding filing fees in full. The Court’s records reflect a balance still due in the amount of \$350.00 in Case No. 12-cv-00983-MJR-SCW; \$332.02 in Case No. 12-cv-01090-JPG; \$400.00 in Case No. 15-cv-00861-JPG-SCW; \$388.93 in Case No. 15-cv-00876-JPG (appeal); \$294.07 in Case No. 15-cv-00889-JPG-SCW; \$350.00 in Case No. 15-cv-00890-JPG-DGW; \$350.00 in Case No. 15-cv-00891-SMY-PMF; and \$350.00 in Case No. 15-cv-00921-SMY-RJD. Plaintiff’s outstanding filing fees total \$2,815.02. Until he pays this amount, his request for relief is **DENIED**. The filing restriction (Doc. 80) remains in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 11/21/2023

s/J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
United States District Court